DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 081 337 HE 004 494

AUTHOR Williamson, W. J.; And Others
TITLE The Commuting Student Study, Report IV: Food Facilities.
INSTITUTION Alberta Univ., Edmonton. Office of Institutional Research and Planning.
PUB DATE Apr 72
NOTE 52p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS College Students; Commuting Students; *Dining Facilities; *Food Handling Facilities; *Food Service; *Higher Education; *Physical Facilities; Research Projects
IDENTIFIERS *University of Alberta

ABSTRACT

This report presents a detailed analysis of the food facilities at the University of Alberta. Emphasis is placed on the three main supplies of food: the peak production of cafeterias at meal times, the snack facilities, and vending machines. Study results indicate: (1) extensive use of the students' union building cafeterias; (2) reported use of vending machines is high (80%); (3) over 50% of the sample reported bringing bag lunches; (4) food facilities for resident students are satisfactory; (5) students who reported returning home for meals (42.5% of the sample) indicated they were satisfied with the arrangements; and (6) the main place for eating remains the students' union building followed by buildings which house the larger vending machine complexes. Appendices include statistical data. Related documents are HE 004 491, HE 004 492, HE 004 493, and HE 004 526. (MJM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

IR 004 444

OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND PLANNING
THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA EDMONTON 7, ALBERTA

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 081337

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

1970/71

REPORT IV -- FOOD FACILITIES

BY

WM. J. WILLIAMSON
JUDY BRUNT
GEORGE N. S. ZAHARIA

OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND PLANNING

APRIL, 1972

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	GENERAL INTRODUCTION	1
II.	MAJOR CONCLUSIONS	2
III.	CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE	4
IV.	BRIEF EXAMINATION OF TIME FACTOR	8
V.	DETAILED EXAMINATION OF FOOD FACILITIES	14
VI.	CONCLUSIONS	25

APPENDICES

I.	STUDENT COMMENTS	28
II.	USE-IMPORTANCE AND SATISFACTION SUMMARY -- OTHER FOOD FACILITIES	34
III.	RESPONDENTS USAGE OF THE VARIOUS FOOD FACILITIES AVAILABLE TO THEM	36

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Faculty Distribution of Survey Respondents cf. Total University Enrolment	5
II.	Age and Sex Distribution of Survey Respondents cf. Total University Enrolment	6
III.	Marital Status of Survey Respondents cf. University Enrolment	7
IV.	Home Address (Origin) of Survey Respondents cf. Total University Enrolment	9
V.	Survey Respondents Place of Residence	10
VI.	Student Informal Campus Time Distribution I	11
VII.	Student Informal Campus Time Distribution II	12
VIII.	Student Informal Campus Time Distribution III (Units are Students)	13
IX.	Use-Importance and Satisfaction Summary -- Students' Union Building	16
X.	Use-Importance and Satisfaction Summary -- Lister Hall	18
XI.	Use-Importance and Satisfaction Summary -- Vending Machines	19
XII.	Use-Importance and Satisfaction Summary -- Bag Lunch	21
XIII.	Use-Importance and Satisfaction Summary -- Return Home	23
XIV.	Core Questions -- Food Facilities	24

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study, as one in a series of campus informal student space studies, was conceived and carried out by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning as part of the Long Range Development Plan of the University of Alberta. Gratefully acknowledged is the valuable assistance provided by Dr. Wm. A. Preshing, Dr. David Otto, Mr. Ken Coull and Mr. Bill Buxton. Without their help this study would not have been possible. Thanks also goes to Mrs. Minnie Cutts who typed the report.

The cooperation of Administrative Data Processing has been very important to this study and is greatly appreciated. Last but not least, our sincere thanks to the students who completed the questionnaire and shared with us their views on campus life.

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

I. GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The University of Alberta has traditionally been thought of as a residential institution. In fact, as early as 1911, when Athabasca Hall was built it housed both staff and students as well as serving as a library, gymnasium and administrative office for the three-year old University. The enrolment has mushroomed from 185 in 1911 to 18,336 in 1971. The growth of the metro Edmonton area has been extensive and as these changes manifest themselves it is necessary for the University to change so as to meet the needs of the students. Whereas in 1911, when the first residence was built 23% of the students were in residence, in 1971 only 12% of those enrolled lived in residences. This decrease in the percentage of the number of students living in the residences increases the number of students who commute to campus. Because the demand for the university residences has decreased, attention must be given in the planning and development of space facilities for the on-campus non-class activities of commuting students, including food facilities.

With these thoughts in mind the Office of Institutional Research and Planning has undertaken a critical examination of the commuting student phenomenon on the University of Alberta campus. In our study we have attempted to look at the time the student spends on campus outside of the classroom. We have tried to separate the resident from the non-resident student in anticipation that the space needs of these two groups,

although similar, are not the same.

Report I, Patterns in University Commuting (June, 1971), indicated the following trends: (1) an increase in commuters using all modes of transportation, especially the bus, (2) an increase in the number of students in the 25+ age group, and an increase in the number of married students with added family responsibilities, and (3) an increase in the demand for jobs both on and off campus. These findings indicate that an effort should be made to adapt to the extensive change in student patterns of University life. A final report will deal with the behavioural aspects of these changes.

II. MAJOR CONCLUSIONS

To satisfy the appetites and tastes of a community of over 18,000 people daily is no small task. To provide fast and inexpensive food served at the desired temperature while retaining quality is an even harder task. Like any restaurant, the food facilities on campus must be geared for peak production at regular meal times, i.e., breakfast, lunch and supper. In addition to traditional meal times, snack facilities are provided thoughout the day by the facilities located in the Students' Union Building, Central Academic Building (not fully in operation at time of study) and Lister Hall. For those students who do not have enough time to eat in the Students' Union Building, there are vending machines throughout the campus dispensing soft drinks and coffee, sandwiches, hot dogs and pastries, etc.

The results of our study are as follows:

1. There was an extensive use of the Students' Union Building cafeterias at the time of our study. The complaints of overcrowding have been alleviated as a result of the opening of the new Central Academic Building cafeteria.

2. Reported use of vending machines is quite high (80%) indicating that students are relying on the machines for part of their dietary needs either as a supplement to their bag lunches, or for quick snacks and in some cases, whole meals. The chief dissatisfaction expressed dealt with the poor servicing of machines. A few people mentioned the poor quality of the food in the machines and requested that specific types of food (e.g., health foods) be made available in the machines.

3. Over 50% of our sample reported bringing bag lunches to University. As there are no designated bag lunch areas on campus at present, students are eating them not only in cafeterias but also in classrooms, lounges and offices. A number of people mentioned that they supplemented their bag lunch with food from vending machines as well as cafeterias.

4. Lister Hall is used almost exclusively by residence students. The degree of satisfaction expressed by the residence students in our sample ranged from 42.5% for the low users to 71.1% for the high users. Thus, it would appear that Lister Hall seems to be fulfilling its function for its tenants.

5. Those students who reported returning home for meals (42.5% of our sample) indicated they were satisfied with this arrangement.

6. The main places for eating remains the Students' Union Building followed by the buildings which house the larger vending machine complexes, e.g., Marshall Tory, Bio-Sciences and Education.

7. Early indications are that the new Central Academic Building cafeteria, which is on the site of the old Hot Cafe, is going to be used very well. Satisfaction with the new facility is very high as indicated by Appendix II.

III. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE

Tables I-V compare the students surveyed in the study with the total University full-time day-winter session enrolment of 1970/71. Inspection of these tables show that, generally, the Commuting Student sample is representative of the University enrolment. Specifically, Table I shows all faculties to be well represented in the survey with the possible exception of students from the professional faculties including Dentistry, Library Science, Medicine and Graduate Studies.

With regards to Table II, the age of those students surveyed was generally older (mean survey age 20.5 years) than the related total University enrolment. This was interpreted as a definite asset since the students surveyed had experienced University space facilities for a longer period of time. Of the students surveyed, more female students were involved relative to the total University enrolment.

Table III shows that proportionately, more single students were surveyed than there are enrolled at University. Consequently, only 17.7% rather than 26.9% of the married students at the University of Alberta

TABLE I

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

1970/71

Faculty Distribution of Survey Respondents cf. Total University Enrolment

FACULTY	TOTAL SURVEY		TOTAL UNIVERSITY ENROLMENT*	
	No. of Students	% of Survey	No. of Students	% of Total
Arts	265	20.7	3,091	16.9
Agriculture	30	2.3	422	2.3
Business Administration & Commerce	75	5.9	1,118	6.1
College St. Jean	1	0.1	88	0.5
Dental Hygiene	3	0.2	50	0.3
Dentistry	4	0.3	197	1.1
Education	309	24.1	4,236	23.1
Engineering	98	7.6	1,380	7.5
Home Economics	29	2.3	324	1.7
Law	14	1.1	366	2.0
Library Science	-	-	44	0.2
Medical Laboratory Science	8	0.6	88	0.5
Medicine	23	1.8	589	3.2
Nursing	16	1.2	240	1.3
Pharmacy	15	1.2	303	1.6
Physical Education	28	2.2	598	3.3
Rehabilitation Medicine	27	2.1	215	1.2
Science	225	17.6	2,830	15.4
Graduate Studies	112	8.7	2,157	11.8
TOTAL STUDENTS	1,282	100.0%	18,336	100.0%

*Based on Registrar's data.

TABLE II

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

1970/71

Age and Sex Distribution of Survey Respondents cf. Total University Enrolment

AGE	NO. OF MALE STUDENTS	NO. OF FEMALE STUDENTS	TOTAL STUDENTS		NO. OF MALE STUDENTS	NO. OF FEMALE STUDENTS	TOTAL UNIVERSITY ENROLMENT*	
			No.	%			No.	%
16 to 19 years	122	135	257	20.0	2,896	2,853	5,749	31.3
20 to 21 years	215	234	449	35.0	2,879	2,208	5,087	27.7
22 to 25 years	233	117	350	27.3	3,272	1,048	4,320	23.6
26 to 30 years	91	34	125	9.8	1,472	379	1,851	10.1
31 to 40 years	52	29	81	6.3	676	312	988	5.4
41 to 50 years	7	8	15	1.2	142	147	289	1.6
Over 51 years	1	4	5	0.4	18	34	52	.3
TOTAL STUDENTS	721 - 56.2%	561 - 43.8%	1,282	100.0%	11,355 - 61.9%	6,981 - 28.1%	18,336	100.0%

*Based on Registrar's data.

TABLE III

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

1970/71

Marital Status of Survey Respondents cf. University Enrolment

MARITAL STATUS	TOTAL SURVEY		TOTAL UNIVERSITY ENROLMENT*	
	No. of Students	%	No. of Students	%
Single	1,052	82.1	13,396	73.1
Married	230	17.9	4,940	26.9
TOTAL STUDENTS	1,282	100.0%	18,336	100.0%

*Based on Registrar's data.

were surveyed.

Table IV, which shows the home origin of students surveyed in relation to total University enrolment, indicates that 88% are Albertans while the remaining 12% are from outside the province or Canada.

Table V, which shows the place of residence of students surveyed, indicates that 14.5% of the sample are on-campus residence students. More specifically, with respect to the nature of this study, 85% of those students surveyed live off-campus and are commuting from the various city points.

From examination of the five tables, it would appear that the respondents surveyed represent the University students' attitudes toward campus informal student space needs. The exception to this would appear to be a light return from the students of some of the professional faculties, many of whom are likely married, have children and would therefore be as much in need of study and eating space as those students surveyed.

IV. BRIEF EXAMINATION OF TIME FACTOR

The questionnaire asked students to indicate the amount of time they spent on free time activities while on campus. An examination of Table VI shows that most students have between twelve and twenty-four hours of free time per week. This free time was then allocated by percentage to activities such as studying, eating, lounging, etc. From Table VII it can be noted that the greatest expenditure of free time is devoted to studying, followed then by lounging and eating.

Table VIII, which shows the informal time patterns of students

TABLE IV

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

1970/71

Home Address (Origin) of Survey Respondents cf. Total University Enrolment

GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION	TOTAL SURVEY		TOTAL UNIVERSITY ENROLMENT*	
	No.	%	No.	%
Edmonton	728	56.8	11,336	61.8
Urban Alberta	193	15.1	2,569	14.0
Rural Alberta	207	16.1	2,435	13.3
Other Canada	58	4.5	1,123	6.1
United States	8	0.6	108	.6
Central and South America	5	0.4	76	.4
Europe and South Pacific	23	1.8	65	.4
Asia	52	4.1	520	2.8
Africa and Middle East	8	0.6	104	.6
TOTAL STUDENTS	1,282	100.0%	18,336	100.0%

*Based on Registrar's data.

TABLE V

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

1970/71

Survey Respondents Place of Residence

LOCATION	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	PERCENT
University Residence	186	14.5
Home	592	46.2
Apartment	266	20.7
Suite or Sleeping Room	127	9.9
Student Coop Housing	25	2.0
Other	74	5.8
No Response	12	0.9
TOTAL STUDENTS	1,282	100.0%

TABLE VI

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

1970/71

Student Informal Campus Time Distribution I

TIME ALLOCATION	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS
Less than 3 Hours Per Week	78	6.1
From 3 to 6 Hours Per Week	232	18.1
From 6 to 12 Hours Per Week	206	16.1
From 12 to 24 Hours Per Week	355	27.6
From 24 to 36 Hours Per Week	228	17.8
From 36 to 48 Hours Per Week	67	5.2
More than 48 Hours Per Week	78	6.1
No Response	38	3.0
TOTAL STUDENTS	1,282	100.0%

TABLE VII

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

1970/71

Student Informal Campus Time Distribution II

INFORMAL TIME USE CATEGORIES	AVERAGE TIME ALLOCATION IN PERCENT BY SURVEY RESPONDENTS						TOTAL PERCENT AND STUDENTS	
	Studying	Eating	Lounging	Recreation	Service and Commercial	Other	%	Students
From 0 to 12 Hours Per Week	42.3	19.0	21.7	10.2	2.7	4.1	100	516
From 12 to 24 Hours Per Week	49.8	14.3	18.7	10.0	1.9	5.3	100	355
From 24 to 36 Hours Per Week	54.0	12.8	16.6	10.0	2.4	4.2	100	288
From 36 to 48 Hours Per Week	57.1	11.0	12.6	9.6	3.1	6.6	100	67
Sub Total Average	50.8	14.3	17.4	10.0	2.5	5.0	100	N/A
More than 48 Hours Per Week	50.5	8.8	11.6	11.1	3.3	14.7	100	78
Grand Total Average	50.7	13.2	16.2	10.2	2.7	7.0	100	N/A
TOTAL STUDENTS								1,244
No Response								38
TOTAL STUDENTS SURVEYED								1,282

TABLE VIII

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

1970-71

Student Informal Campus Time Distribution III (Units are Students)

FACULTY	TIME ALLOCATION							TOTAL STUDENTS
	Less than 3 Hours Per Week	From 3 to 6 Hours Per Week	From 6 to 12 Hours Per Week	From 12 to 24 Hours Per Week	From 24 to 36 Hours Per Week	From 36 to 48 Hours Per Week	More than 48 Hours Per Week	
Agriculture	0	6	3	12	6	0	0	27 - 2.5%
Arts	13	35	39	86	44	9	5	231 - 21.1%
Business Administration & Commerce	2	10	9	15	17	9	3	65 - 5.9%
College St. Jean	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1 - .1%
Dental Hygiene	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1 - .1%
Dentistry	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	4 - .4%
Education	21	67	51	73	49	7	5	273 - 25.0%
Engineering	1	14	10	30	20	4	4	83 - 7.6%
Graduate Studies	13	13	6	20	15	17	12	96 - 8.8%
Household Economics	0	4	9	7	2	1	0	23 - 2.1%
Law	1	0	0	4	4	1	2	12 - 1.1%
Medical Laboratory Science	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	6 - .5%
Medicine	5	7	5	4	1	0	1	23 - 2.1%
Nursing	0	4	3	6	1	0	0	14 - 1.3%
Pharmacy	0	1	1	3	3	0	0	8 - .7%
Physical Education	0	2	1	10	7	2	0	22 - 2.0%
Rehabilitation Medicine	1	3	5	4	6	1	1	21 - 1.9%
Science	7	26	37	56	38	13	7	184 - 16.8%
TOTAL	65 - 5.8%	199 - 18.2%	180 - 16.5%	331 - 30.3%	215 - 19.7%	64 - 5.8%	40 - 3.7%	1,094 - 100%

surveyed by faculty, indicates heavier informal time allocations attributable to the heavier courses such as graduate studies. Activities such as student teaching, graduate teaching assistant employment, and hospital experience appear to explain part of the low campus informal time expenditure for certain Education, Graduate and Medical students. Please note that in the case of Table VIII, only 1,094 of the 1,282 surveyed respondents could be identified as to faculty and time allocation.

V. DETAILED EXAMINATION OF FOOD FACILITIES

Whereas previously we have emphasized the different needs that students have simply due to the fact they are students, this report deals with the student as a consumer of food at the University of Alberta. Three factors should be considered in dealing with this basic need.

1. In order to fulfill nutritional requirements of people, certain basic foods should be provided.

2. In a community of over 18,000 students, there is such a diversity of tastes and appetites that it is almost impossible to satisfy everyone's food preferences all of the time.

3. Since students do not have an excess of either free time or money, they require good food with a minimum expenditure of time and money. This report deals with the feelings of student regarding existing food facilities and what the students feel they want in the way of new food facilities.

(a) Use and Satisfaction of On-Campus Food Facilities

At the time of our study, on-campus food facilities consisted of cafeteria style hot food facilities in the Students' Union Building and Lister Hall. The vending machine facilities ranged from simple soft drink and candy machines to complexes of vending machines such as are located in the Education and Marshall Tory Buildings. Since the time of our study a new hot food facility has opened in the Central Academic Building. This new cafeteria has taken a considerable load off the Students' Union cafeterias. We shall consider the food facilities on campus individually, according to the amount of use and the degree of satisfaction as expressed by the students in our sample.

(a) - 1 -- Students' Union Building. We observe from Table IX that a total of 66.1% of our sample reported using the food facilities in the Students' Union Building with the majority in the low and medium use-importance categories. This high overall use situation could, in fact, have been predicted as there existed at that time a kind of captive market situation, because of the lack of another major on-campus commuter student eating facility. The other major on-campus eating facility--the Central Academic Building--did not open until February 15, 1971 (essentially after this study) and thus recorded only small student use as will be later presented in the report. (Appendix II).

Satisfaction with the facilities was expressed by 34.5% of our sample while 23.6% of the respondents expressed dissatisfaction. The

TABLE IX

USE-IMPORTANCE AND SATISFACTION SUMMARY

Students Union Building

	USE-IMPORTANCE OF FACILITIES		NUMERICAL AND PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF IMPORTANCE-USE CATEGORY BY DEGREE OF SATISFACTION							
			SATISFIED		NEITHER		DISSATISFIED		TOTALS	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
High	176	13.7	113	64.2	17	9.8	46	26.0	176	100.0
Medium	302	23.6	172	57.1	47	15.6	83	27.3	302	100.0
Low	369	28.8	148	40.2	97	26.2	124	33.6	369	100.0
SUB-TOTAL	847	66.1								
Don't Use	353	27.5	17	4.9	245	69.3	91	25.8	353	100.0
No Response	82	6.4							82	
TOTAL	1282	100.0							1282	

SATISFACTION WITH FACILITIES			SATISFACTION SUMMARY		
	Number	Percent		Number	Percent
Very Satisfied	82	6.4	Positive Satisfaction	442	34.5
Satisfied	360	28.1			
Neither	303	23.6	Neutral	303	23.6
Dissatisfied	188	14.7	Negative Satisfaction	302	23.6
Very Dissatisfied	114	8.9			
No Response	235	18.3	No Response	235	18.3

main complaint with the Students' Union Building food was its quality. In one of our core questions, Table XIV, we asked if students would be willing to pay more for better quality food on campus. The number of positive responses (36.6%) slightly outweighed the negative ones (35.2%) indicating that students are approximately equally divided as to whether they would be willing to spend more money on food providing it was of better quality. Some students indicated that a lack of money and time resulted in their not purchasing more food on campus. Another core question asked if students found cafeteria food satisfactory to which 36.2% responded positively and 30.7% responded negatively. However, when one considers the size of the neutral responses (31.8%), overall indications are that many people have no strong feelings of either contentment or discontentment with the facilities.

(a) - 2 -- Lister Hall. The food facilities in Lister Hall are primarily for residence students. Thus the use-importance as shown by Table X is low at 17.3% while 71.7% of the respondents did not use the facilities. In considering those who do use Lister Hall the satisfaction ranges from 42.9% as expressed by the low users to 71.1% for high users. Thus, Lister Hall seems to be fulfilling its function as a residence dining hall.

(a) - 3 -- Vending Machines. Table XI indicates that 80.9% of our sample reported using the vending machines. The majority of these students reported use in the medium use-importance category (37.0%). The

TABLE X

USE-IMPORTANCE AND SATISFACTION SUMMARY

Lister Hall

	USE-IMPORTANCE OF FACILITIES		NUMERICAL AND PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF USE-IMPORTANCE CATEGORY BY DEGREE OF SATISFACTION							
			SATISFIED		NEITHER		DISSATISFIED		TOTALS	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
High	153	11.9	109	71.1	14	9.2	30	19.8	153	100.0
Medium	15	1.2	9	60.0	2	13.3	4	26.6	15	100.0
Low	54	4.2	23	42.9	20	36.7	11	20.4	54	100.0
SUB-TOTAL	222	17.3								
Don't Use	919	71.7	25	2.7	846	92.1	48	5.2	919	100.0
No Response	141	11.0							141	
TOTAL	1282	100.0							1282	100.0

SATISFACTION WITH FACILITIES			SATISFACTION SUMMARY		
	Number	Percent		Number	Percent
Very Satisfied	28	2.2	Positive Satisfaction	152	11.9
Satisfied	124	9.7			
Neither	515	40.2	Neutral	515	40.2
Dissatisfied	35	2.7	Negative Satisfaction	71	5.5
Very Dissatisfied	36	2.8			
No Response	544	42.4	No Response	310	24.2

TABLE XI

USE-IMPORTANCE AND SATISFACTION SUMMARY

Vending Machines

	USE-IMPORTANCE OF FACILITIES		NUMERICAL AND PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF USE-IMPORTANCE CATEGORY BY DEGREE OF SATISFACTION							
			SATISFIED		NEITHER		DISSATISFIED		TOTALS	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
High	293	22.9	197	67.3	14	4.8	82	27.9	293	100.0
Medium	475	37.0	348	73.3	47	9.9	80	16.8	475	100.0
Low	268	20.9	171	63.8	46	17.1	51	19.1	268	100.0
SUB-TOTAL		80.9							1036	
Don't Use	123	9.6							123	100.0
No Response	123	9.6							123	100.0
TOTAL	1282	100.0							1282	

SATISFACTION WITH FACILITIES			SATISFACTION SUMMARY		
	Number	Percent		Number	Percent
Very Satisfied	140	10.9	Positive Satisfaction	703	54.8
Satisfied	563	43.9			
Neither	161	12.6	Neutral	161	12.6
Dissatisfied	145	11.3	Negative Satisfaction	217	16.9
Very Dissatisfied	72	5.6			
No Response	201	15.7	No Response	201	15.7

satisfaction expressed by those using the vending machines indicated that over half of our sample (54.8%) are satisfied with the vending machines at present. Response to our core question about the adequacy of vending machine food (Table XIV) indicates that 37.7% of our sample felt that vending machine food was inadequate. Comments made by those in our sample (16.1%) substantiated these feelings. Many people commented that the food and drinks left much to be desired while others were concerned about the poor servicing of the machines. One student stated, "They are empty by the time you go for lunch if you do not line up at the beginning of the lunch hour".

(a) - 4 -- Bag Lunch. There is almost no way to assess the exact number of students who rely solely on the bag lunch. A number of students in our sample indicated that they will supplement their bag lunch with a bowl of soup or a drink from either the vending machines or the cafeterias. Others stated that they only bring bag lunches on certain days and go to the cafeterias on other days. Our assessment is further complicated by the fact that there are no designated bag lunch areas on campus. Therefore, students eat bag lunches almost anywhere, including lounges and classrooms. Consulting Table XII we find that half of our sample reported bringing bag lunches (50.9%). The satisfaction level is considerably lower than would be anticipated at 36.1%, indicating that students aren't too pleased with this arrangement. One may speculate on whether the low satisfaction rate is due to the quality of food or to the type of physical surroundings in which the student eats

TABLE XII

USE-IMPORTANCE AND SATISFACTION SUMMARY

Bag Lunch

	USE-IMPORTANCE OF FACILITIES		NUMERICAL AND PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF USE-IMPORTANCE CATEGORY BY DEGREE OF SATISFACTION							
			SATISFIED		NEITHER		DISSATISFIED		TOTALS	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
High	336	26.2	255	75.8	26	7.8	55	16.5	336	100.0
Medium	238	18.6	178	75.0	28	11.6	32	13.3	238	100.0
Low	78	6.1	40	50.6	19	24.7	19	24.8	78	100.0
SUB-TOTAL	652	50.9							652	
Don't Use	275	21.5	39	14.3	118	42.9	118	42.9	275	100.0
No Response	355	27.6							355	100.0
TOTAL	1282	100.0							1282	

SATISFACTION WITH FACILITIES			SATISFACTION SUMMARY		
	Number	Percent		Number	Percent
Very Satisfied	137	10.7	Positive Satisfaction	462	36.1
Satisfied	325	25.4			
Neither	194	15.1	Neutral	194	15.1
Dissatisfied	68	5.3	Negative Satisfaction	109	8.5
Very Dissatisfied	41	3.2			
No Response	517	40.3	No Response	517	40.3

his bag lunch. Responses to the core question asking if students preferred to bring lunch rather than to buy food on campus (Table XIV) indicates that at least 21.4% of the students prefer to bring their lunch rather than to buy it. The comments made tend to substantiate these feelings, with many students pointing out that the prime reasons for bringing lunch were the lack of finances and/or the overcrowding of the cafeterias at meal time. Another reason stated for bringing bag lunches was that the quality of the food at the cafeterias was thought to be inconsistent, i.e., couldn't depend on good food all the time.

(a) - 5 -- Return Home. We observe in Table XIII that 42.5% of our sample reported returning home for lunch while the corresponding satisfaction level is 35.2%. The high return rate can possibly be accounted for by two factors: (1) a number of our sample, including campus residence students, live within convenient walking distance to the campus; and, (2) for many other students, however, return home appears to mean "coasting" from a good breakfast through to the next meal at home presumably, supper! Vending machines very likely assist this group of students.

(b) Additional Observations on Food Facilities

Students were asked to indicate what type of lounge facility they would like to have on campus. Since this was an open-ended question the exact number of responses varied. However, of those students who mentioned food facilities, some felt that food facilities of some

TABLE XIII

USE-IMPORTANCE AND SATISFACTION SUMMARY

Return Home

	USE-IMPORTANCE OF FACILITIES		NUMERICAL AND PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF USE-IMPORTANCE CATEGORY BY DEGREE OF SATISFACTION							
			SATISFIED		NEITHER		DISSATISFIED		TOTALS	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
High	289	22.5	261	90.5	18	6.2	10	3.3	289	100.0
Medium	170	13.3	153	90.0	11	6.3	6	3.7	170	100.0
Low	86	6.7	61	70.9	22	25.3	3	3.8	86	100.0
SUB-TOTAL	545	42.5							545	
Don't Use	260	20.3	11	4.2	234	90.0	15	5.8	260	100.0
No Response	477	37.2							477	100.0
TOTAL	1282	100.0							1282	

SATISFACTION WITH FACILITIES			SATISFACTION SUMMARY		
	Number	Percent		Number	Percent
Very Satisfied	249	19.4	Positive Satisfaction	452	35.2
Satisfied	203	15.8			
Neither	156	12.2	Neutral	156	12.2
Dissatisfied	17	1.3	Negative Satisfaction	25	1.9
Very Dissatisfied	8	0.6			
No Response	649	50.6	No Response	649	50.6

CORE QUESTIONS - FOOD FACILITIES

TABLE XIV

CORE QUESTION	POSITIVE RESPONSES		NEUTRAL		NEGATIVE RESPONSES		NO RESPONSE		COMMENTS	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
12. Would Spend more money on campus food if higher quality	468	36.6	353	27.5	452	35.2	9	0.7	159	11.9
14. Vending machine food is adequate	459	35.8	326	25.4	484	37.7	13	1.0	219	16.1
31. Prefer to bring lunch than to buy food on campus	746	58.1	299	21.4	245	19.1	17	1.3	100	7.9
41. Cafeteria food is satisfactory	465	36.2	407	31.8	393	30.7	17	1.4	87	6.8

nature should be available, in the lounges, while others felt that food facilities should be close by. Of those mentioning food, 57 students stated that they would prefer to have no food facilities of any kind in the lounge. The diversification of opinion is to be expected, there being several alternate food facility arrangements preferred by students. In general, however, most students prefer separate but close food and lounge facilities and this type of decentralized food facility in addition to more major food facility areas are worthy of consideration.

In another open-ended question, students were asked to comment on any facilities which they felt were inadequate or totally absent on campus. The largest complaint to this question dealt with the disposable dishes which are now being used in the cafeteria at the Central Academic Building. Students expressed concern with the distastefulness of hacking at their food on a cardboard plate with plastic cutlery and contributing to the pollution. Mentioned also, was the lack of a liquor facility on campus.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

The findings of this study indicate that the on-campus non-class activity which consumes the third largest amount of free time (preceded by lounging and studying) is eating. Students spend up to 14% of their non-classroom on campus time making use of the food facilities on campus. As expressed on the questionnaire, students are primarily concerned that food be of good quality and be obtainable with a minimum expenditure of

time and money. Taking these three factors into consideration and adding a fourth--uncrowded facilities, we looked at the existing food facilities on campus.

1. There was a shortage of on-campus eating facilities at the time of our first sample. Thus the cafeterias in the Students' Union Building bore the brunt of the noontime crowd for hot meals. By the time the second sample came in, indications were that the new Central Academic Building cafeteria would alleviate some of the overcrowding in the Students' Union Building.

2. Students who bring bag lunches do so for three main reasons: (1) lack of finances to purchase cafeteria food; (2) reluctance to spend money on available food which they feel is of poor quality; and, (3) lack of time to spend in obtaining food due to class schedules. Most people supplement their bag lunches with drinks or other foods from the vending machines or the cafeterias.

3. The vending machines constitute a very large network of decentralized sources of food. Although over half our sample reported being satisfied with the vending machine facilities some students complained that the machines are poorly serviced. Other complaints dealt with the quality and lack of variety in vending machine food.

4. From the open-ended questions we found that students would like to see food snack facilities close to smaller decentralized lounge facilities on campus. These smaller areas could possibly be served in different ways ranging from vending machines to waitress-served facilities.

Overall, students seem to be fairly satisfied with the food facilities on campus at the present time.

APPENDIX I

APPENDIX I

STUDENT COMMENTS

The following information represents written comments by the students surveyed regarding campus eating facilities. The question which drew the comment is included for added clarity, and the answers will give additional insight into student attitudes for planning purposes.

1. "I would spend more money on campus food if it were of higher quality."

. . . Really do not feel qualified to answer, I am compelled to eat here at SUB - and find the food adequate if uninspired.

. . . The food on campus is terrible and much too expensive. The new ACADEMIC building has good food, but the plastic eating utensils and styrofoam bowls put me right off it!

. . . I bring two bag lunches a day (lunch and supper) because the prices charged now are extravagant for the quality. Even sandwiches taste better than SUB hanburgers. Yet, even if the quality improved, I could not afford to buy both lunch and supper every day of the week.

. . . I find the food in SUB, at the University of CALGARY very much better in every way than here.

. . . I spend too much money on food - period!

2. "Vending machine food is adequate".

. . . Campus food and vending machine food is adequate, but that doesn't mean it couldn't be better, perhaps more varied.

. . . Vending machines should take into consideration that many people diet - everything is fattening except apples which they only recently have. Suggestions: bran muffins, ju-jubes (weight watchers), oranges, fresca pop.

. . . More turkey sandwiches in vending machines.

. . . These appear to be too many quick carbohydrate "filler" meals and not enough variety.

. . . Health foods should be introduced. Only good way for people to live.

. . . Vending machine food is adequate if you subsist on chocolate milk and chocolate bars - these are the types of vending machines to which I have access in my building.

. . . I have acne trouble and must limit consumption of oils. Hamburgers, hot dogs, chocolate, cheese, are not allowed. The vending machines do not provide much that I should eat. But, then again, everyone does not have this problem.

. . . Vending machine food is never adequate, but I wonder even though it tastes badly, it's always sold out.

. . . Vending machine is very inadequate. They are empty by the time you go for lunch, if you do not line up at the beginning of the lunch hour.

. . . The food in the vending machines does not refill very quickly.

. . . Vending machines do not seem to work half the time, especially in Education when the attendents are told, they are very impolite and down right nasty. These women sometimes are even reluctant to give change ($2.00, $5.00).

. . . I am not a particularly violent man - but I must admit - murder of those diabolical metal monsters has often entered my mind.

. . . I don't buy my food on campus, but if I do, it's from the vending machines and they contain very good food.

. . . Foods such as cheese hot dogs are not serviced properly - the hot dog is usually frozen and if you just melt the cheese slightly so there would be no mess, the hot dog is still frozen.

. . . The food is quite adequate, but the hot beverages leave <u>much</u> to be desired.

. . . I find the vending machines the best thing going in food service - I prefer it to a restaurant or cafeteria situation.

. . . Wish the vending machine pop quality would be up-graded.

. . . I am very satisfied with the vending machine service.

3. <u>"I prefer bringing my lunch to buying food on campus".</u>

. . . I cannot afford to buy lunches.

. . . My lunch is half and half bought and brought.

. . . Because of the cost of food.

. . . Some things in SUB cafeteria charges are kind of ridiculous (e.g., extra gravy, slice of butter).

. . . I found it is more economical and advantageous for me to bring a lunch because when I used to buy my lunch I did not have money left over for anything else.

. . . Food in vending machines is expensive. Two slices of bread and a slice of ham, beef or whatever are not worth what the vending machines charge.

. . . I bring my lunch because cafeterias are too crowded and the food is not the best.

. . . It's much easier for me to bring lunch as I don't really have enough time to go and get it somewhere on campus.

4. "A less than adequate diet affects my physical and emotional well being."

. . . It only makes me bad-tempered.

. . . My worries produce bad well-being which causes poor digestion and diet.

. . . Only applies when I force myself to go without adequate food in attempts to loose weight.

5. "Cafeteria food is satisfactory."

. . . Yes, it's satisfactory, but it should be good, tasty, healthy.

. . . Sometimes we get the impression that the food budget has run out.

. . . Lister food isn't all as bad as everyone makes it sound - it just gets monotonous. I don't know about SUB caf.

. . . Cafeteria food in SUB leaves much to be desired.

. . . The food in SUB is a bit too expensive. If SUB is built for us, why try to make a profit on us?

The following question was inserted into the commuting student questionnaire to ascertain student ideas on the ideal student lounge. The student answers that follow the question are included here as they relate to eating facility ideas relative to the ideal lounge.

"Describe what type of facility you consider ideal for relaxing, talking, and spending free time? Keep in mind such aspects as lighting, size, seating, food facilities (or their absence), location, atmosphere, etc."

. . . I think that the type of lounge needed for people to relax in should be fairly small with sound absorbing walls or walls that will not throw your words back at you. It should have some food facilities, but something that is only a snack, like coffee and donuts or something like that. The atmosphere should be relaxing with cool lights in the room, preferably a soft blue or green. There should also be soft music playing in the background. Very soft. It should be in a basement unless it would be very well insulated. It should be away from crowds and large avenues which people use often. Some people might say, why not play rock music but I have found that the more rock music played the higher the pitch of conversation goes, so someone puts up the music so they can hear it, as a result the voices get louder, etc., etc., until everyone walks out more tense than when they came in.

. . . One supposes that the lounging areas of the Central Academic Building is a sort of desirable prototype - it is large enough not to be constricting, light and airy. Moreover, the seating is so arranged that it is possible to have private or small group talks, without other groups or individuals impinging on one's consciousness - also, it is reasonably centred and hence, it is a convenient rendesvous spot, the food facilities are also within easy reach. However, it lacks the variety of SUB, which in turn, suffers from a chaotic rush of itinerant students (to be avoided).

. . . If I ever find a place with the seats of Sub, the atmosphere of the Rutherford coffee room and the food of Zorba's, I'll describe it for you.

. . . The best places are usually those reserved for Profs such as top of Ed Building - a place where one can get good coffee and tea. However, I disagree that students should have these places because they abuse them. SUB was great when it was practically a second home to me, spending up to 12 hours a day in it. The theatre lounge was a quiet, clean place to relax and talk and now it is a pig sty. I blame this on lack of adequate facilities, but I contribute it also to my fellow students. There should be more cafeteria places on campus where students may have a cup of coffee and a place to sit

and read or talk.

. . . Tuck Shop was a really cool place - cheap, good food, lots of people, close to campus, lots of room, and especially, atmosphere. Tuck was real collegey - made you feel like a real student.

. . . I consider the facility provided by the Central Academic Building as most suitable to my needs. There is ample room. The seating is comfortable and adequate. It is easily accessible from the other campus buildings. The food facilities are good and, as they should be, they are separated from the lounging area on the main floor. Because of its location the Central Academic Building is an excellent meeting place with an atmosphere conducive to relaxation and conversation.

. . . The Central Academic Complex. There is plenty of seating for relaxation or talking. The food is better than anywhere on campus including the Students' Union Building Cafeteria. The Central Academic Complex is to me the centre of the University and many of my friends agree with me that this complex is great.

APPENDIX II

APPENDIX II

USE - IMPORTANCE AND SATISFACTION SUMMARY

OTHER FOOD FACILITIES

Importance-Use of Facilities		
	No.	%
High	134	10.5
Medium	220	17.2
Low	114	8.9
Sub-Total	468	36.6
Don't Use	133	10.4
No Response	681	53.0
	1282	100.0

Note:

The above table includes all the data as shown to the right.

Percentage Breakdown of Importance-Use Category by Degree of Satisfaction					
Building or Location	Rating	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Total
Nearby Eating Facilities (Drive-Ins, etc.)	High	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
	Medium	82.6	8.7	8.7	100.0
	Low	50.0	28.6	21.4	100.0
	Don't Use	-	-	-	-
Other On-Campus Food Areas	High	51.2	14.6	34.2	100.0
	Medium	78.9	7.9	13.2	100.0
	Low	47.4	31.6	21.0	100.0
	Don't Use	-	-	-	-
Other On-Campus Non Food Areas	High	80.0	6.7	13.3	100.0
	Medium	85.8	7.1	7.7	100.0
	Low	66.7	0.0	33.3	100.0
	Don't Use	-	-	-	-
Housing and Food Services Administration Lunch Rooms	High	75.0	11.1	13.9	100.0
	Medium	78.8	10.6	10.6	100.0
	Low	59.3	18.8	21.9	100.0
	Don't Use	-	-	-	-
Central Academic	High	85.4	4.2	10.4	100.0
	Medium	77.4	6.5	16.1	100.0
	Low	68.2	22.7	9.1	100.0
	Don't Use	-	-	-	-

APPENDIX III

APPENDIX III

The following tables show the respondents usage of the various food facilities available to them. The first part of the table shows faculty usage of the facilities as a percentage of the total for each use category. The second part of the table expresses faculty usage as a percentage of the total respondents within that faculty.

TABLE I

STUDENT RECREATION FACILITIES USE -- IMPORTANCE BY FACULTY

STUDENTS UNION BUILDING

A. Reported in Number of Students and Row Percent

FACULTY	DEGREES OF USE									
	HIGH		MEDIUM		LOW		TOTAL USE		DON'T USE	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Agriculture	1	0.6	4	1.4	11	3.5	16	2.1	10	3.5
Arts	33	19.8	67	23.0	62	19.6	162	20.9	61	21.3
Business Administration & Commerce	14	8.4	18	6.2	19	6.0	51	6.6	11	3.9
College St. Jean	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.4
Dental Hygiene	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Dentistry	1	0.6	1	0.3	1	0.3	3	0.4	1	0.4
Education	39	23.3	60	20.7	84	26.4	183	23.6	77	26.9
Engineering	18	10.8	25	8.6	17	5.3	60	7.7	16	5.6
Graduate Studies	14	8.4	21	7.2	35	11.0	70	9.0	27	9.4
Household Economics	2	1.2	7	2.4	10	3.1	19	2.5	4	1.4
Law	1	0.6	1	0.3	1	0.3	3	0.4	9	3.1
Medical Laboratory Science	0	0.0	2	0.7	3	0.9	5	0.6	2	0.7
Medicine	1	0.6	6	2.1	7	2.2	14	1.8	9	3.1
Nursing	1	0.6	1	0.3	5	1.6	7	0.9	5	2.1
Pharmacy	3	1.8	0	0.0	2	0.6	5	0.6	2	0.7
Physical Education	7	4.2	11	3.8	3	0.9	21	2.7	2	0.7
Rehabilitation Medicine	2	1.2	9	3.1	6	1.9	17	2.2	4	1.4
Science	30	17.9	58	19.9	52	16.4	140	18.0	44	15.4
TOTAL	167		291		318		776		286	

B. Reported in Number of Students and Column Percent

	DEGREES OF USE										
	HIGH		MEDIUM		LOW		TOTAL USE		DON'T USE		TOTAL
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
Agriculture	1	3.8	4	15.4	11	42.3	16	61.5	10	38.5	26
Arts	33	14.8	67	30.0	62	27.8	162	72.6	61	27.4	223
Business Administration & Commerce	14	22.6	18	29.0	19	30.6	51	82.2	11	17.8	62
College St. Jean	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	1
Dental Hygiene	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Dentistry	1	25.0	1	25.0	1	25.0	3	75.0	1	25.0	4
Education	39	15.0	60	23.1	84	32.3	183	70.4	77	29.6	260
Engineering	18	23.7	25	32.9	17	22.4	60	79.0	16	21.0	76
Graduate Studies	14	14.4	21	21.6	35	36.1	70	72.1	27	27.9	97
Household Economics	2	8.7	7	30.4	10	43.5	19	82.6	4	17.4	23
Law	1	8.4	1	8.3	1	8.3	3	25.0	9	75.0	12
Medical Laboratory Science	0	0.0	2	28.6	3	42.8	5	71.4	2	28.6	7
Medicine	1	4.3	6	26.2	7	30.4	14	60.9	9	39.1	23
Nursing	1	7.7	1	7.7	5	38.4	7	53.8	6	46.2	13
Pharmacy	3	42.8	0	0.0	2	28.6	5	71.4	2	28.6	7
Physical Education	7	30.4	11	47.8	3	13.1	21	91.3	2	8.7	23
Rehabilitation Medicine	2	9.5	9	42.9	6	28.6	17	81.0	4	19.0	21
Science	30	16.3	58	31.5	52	28.3	140	76.1	44	23.9	184

TABLE II

STUDENT RECREATION FACILITIES USE -- IMPORTANCE BY FACULTY

LISTER HALL

A. Reported in Number of Students and Row Percent

FACULTY	DEGREES OF USE									
	HIGH		MEDIUM		LOW		TOTAL USE		DON'T USE	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Agriculture	0	0.0	1	10.0	2	4.1	3	3.2	22	2.4
Arts	3	8.8	2	20.0	10	20.4	15	16.1	194	21.6
Business Administration & Commerce	4	11.8	0	0.0	3	6.1	7	7.5	54	6.0
College St. Jean	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.1
Dental Hygiene	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Dentistry	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	0.3
Education	6	17.6	1	10.0	7	14.3	14	15.1	229	25.4
Engineering	7	20.6	0	0.0	3	6.1	10	10.8	66	7.3
Graduate Studies	1	2.9	2	20.0	4	8.2	7	7.5	76	8.4
Household Economics	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	21	2.3
Law	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	1.2
Medical Laboratory Science	0	0.0	1	10.0	0	0.0	1	1.1	5	0.6
Medicine	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.0	1	1.1	20	2.2
Nursing	1	2.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.1	11	1.2
Pharmacy	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	0.7
Physical Education	1	2.9	0	0.0	5	10.2	6	6.5	16	1.8
Rehabilitation Medicine	0	0.0	1	10.0	3	6.1	4	4.3	16	1.8
Science	11	32.5	2	20.0	11	22.5	24	25.7	149	16.7
TOTAL	34		10		49		93		900	

B. Reported in Number of Students and Column Percent

	DEGREES OF USE										
	HIGH		MEDIUM		LOW		TOTAL USE		DON'T USE		TOTAL
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
Agriculture	0	0.0	1	4.0	2	8.0	3	12.0	22	88.0	25
Arts	3	1.4	2	1.0	10	4.8	15	7.2	194	92.8	209
Business Administration & Commerce	4	6.6	0	0.0	3	4.9	7	11.5	54	88.5	61
College St. Jean	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	1
Dental Hygiene	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Dentistry	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	100.0	3
Education	6	2.5	1	0.4	7	2.9	14	5.8	229	94.2	243
Engineering	7	9.2	0	0.0	3	4.0	10	13.2	66	86.8	76
Graduate Studies	1	1.2	2	2.4	4	4.8	7	8.4	76	91.6	83
Household Economics	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	21	100.0	21
Law	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	100.0	11
Medical Laboratory Science	0	0.0	1	16.7	0	0.0	1	16.7	5	83.3	6
Medicine	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.8	1	4.8	20	95.2	21
Nursing	1	8.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	8.3	11	91.7	12
Pharmacy	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	100.0	6
Physical Education	1	4.6	0	0.0	5	22.7	6	27.3	16	72.7	22
Rehabilitation Medicine	0	0.0	1	5.0	3	15.0	4	20.0	16	80.0	20
Science	11	6.4	2	1.2	11	6.4	25	14.0	149	86.0	173

TABLE III

STUDENT FACILITIES USE -- IMPORTANCE BY FACULTY

VENDING MACHINE

A. Reported in Number of Students and Row Percent

FACULTY	DEGREES OF USE									
	HIGH		MEDIUM		LOW		TOTAL USE		DON'T USE	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Agriculture	2	1.2	10	3.4	6	3.2	18	7.8	0	0.0
Arts	37	21.7	63	21.1	38	21.8	138	21.6	20	23.2
Business Administration & Commerce	14	8.0	16	5.2	11	6.1	41	6.4	5	6.0
College St. Jean	0	0.0	1	0.2	0	0.0	1	0.2	0	0.0
Dental Hygiene	0	0.0	1	0.2	0	0.0	1	0.2	0	0.0
Dentistry	2	0.9	1	0.2	0	0.0	3	0.5	0	0.0
Education	51	30.4	85	28.5	29	16.9	165	25.9	15	17.3
Engineering	14	8.0	23	7.6	16	9.0	53	8.3	5	6.0
Graduate Studies	5	2.7	19	6.4	13	7.6	37	5.8	18	20.8
Household Economics	5	2.7	8	2.5	5	2.6	18	2.8	1	1.2
Law	1	0.3	3	1.0	3	1.5	7	1.1	1	1.2
Medical Laboratory Science	1	0.3	2	0.5	2	0.9	5	0.8	1	0.6
Medicine	4	2.1	2	0.7	4	2.0	10	1.6	5	6.0
Nursing	3	1.5	4	1.3	3	1.5	10	1.6	0	0.0
Pharmacy	1	0.3	3	1.0	1	0.6	5	0.8	2	1.8
Physical Education	3	1.5	8	2.7	5	2.6	16	2.5	0	0.0
Rehabilitation Medicine	5	2.7	6	1.8	5	2.9	16	2.5	1	0.6
Science	27	15.8	47	15.8	36	20.9	110	17.2	13	15.5
TOTAL	168		298		172		638		84	

B. Reported in Number of Students and Column Percent

	DEGREES OF USE										
	HIGH		MEDIUM		LOW		TOTAL USE		DON'T USE		TOTAL
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
Agriculture	2	11.4	10	57.1	6	31.4	18	100.0	0	0.0	18
Arts	37	23.3	63	40.3	38	24.0	138	87.3	20	12.7	158
Business Administration & Commerce	14	30.3	16	34.8	11	23.6	41	88.8	5	11.2	46
College St. Jean	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	1
Dental Hygiene	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	1
Dentistry	2	75.0	1	25.0	0	0.0	3	100.0	0	0.0	3
Education	51	28.4	85	47.4	29	16.2	165	91.9	15	8.1	180
Engineering	14	23.9	23	39.8	16	27.4	53	91.2	5	8.8	58
Graduate Studies	5	8.3	19	35.2	13	24.1	37	67.6	18	32.4	55
Household Economics	5	25.7	8	42.9	5	25.7	18	94.3	1	5.7	19
Law	1	7.1	3	42.9	3	35.7	7	85.7	1	14.3	8
Medical Laboratory Science	1	12.5	2	37.5	2	37.5	5	87.5	1	12.5	6
Medicine	4	25.0	2	14.3	4	25.0	10	64.3	5	35.7	15
Nursing	3	27.8	4	44.4	3	27.8	10	100.0	0	0.0	10
Pharmacy	1	8.3	3	50.0	1	16.7	5	75.0	2	25.0	7
Physical Education	3	16.7	8	53.3	5	30.0	16	100.0	0	0.0	16
Rehabilitation Medicine	5	29.0	6	35.5	5	32.3	16	96.8	1	3.2	17
Science	27	21.6	47	38.4	36	29.4	110	89.4	13	10.6	126

TABLE IV

STUDENT RECREATION FACILITIES USE-IMPORTANCE BY FACULTY

Bag Lunch

A. Reported in Number of Students and Row Percent

FACULTY	DEGREES OF USE									
	HIGH		MEDIUM		LOW		TOTAL USE		DON'T USE	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Agriculture	6	3.1	3	1.9	1	2.2	10	2.6	1	0.7
Arts	36	20.4	37	23.5	10	22.0	83	22.0	31	21.5
Business Administration & Commerce	9	4.8	8	4.8	3	5.5	20	5.3	7	4.8
College St. Jean	0	0.0	1	0.3	0	0.0	1	0.3	0	0.0
Dental Hygiene	0	0.0	1	0.3	0	0.0	1	0.3	0	0.0
Dentistry	1	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3	1	0.3
Education	39	22.1	37	23.9	9	19.8	85	22.5	36	24.9
Engineering	15	8.2	15	9.4	3	6.6	33	8.7	7	4.8
Graduate Studies	15	8.5	9	5.8	2	4.4	26	6.9	22	14.9
Household Economics	5	2.5	4	2.6	1	2.2	10	2.6	2	1.4
Law	1	0.6	1	0.6	1	1.1	3	0.8	1	0.3
Medical Laboratory Science	1	0.6	0	0.0	2	3.3	3	0.8	0	0.0
Medicine	4	2.3	1	0.6	1	1.1	6	1.6	8	5.5
Nursing	3	1.7	2	1.0	1	1.1	6	1.6	2	1.0
Pharmacy	2	0.8	3	1.6	1	2.2	6	1.6	1	0.3
Physical Education	3	1.4	3	1.6	2	4.4	8	2.1	3	1.7
Rehabilitation Medicine	5	2.8	8	4.8	2	3.3	15	4.0	1	0.7
Science	35	19.5	27	17.1	10	20.9	72	19.0	25	17.0
TOTAL	177		155		46		378		145	

B. Reported in Number of Students and Column Percent

FACULTY	DEGREES OF USE										
	HIGH		MEDIUM		LOW		TOTAL USE		DON'T USE		TOTAL
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
Agriculture	6	52.4	3	28.6	1	9.5	10	90.5	1	9.5	11
Arts	36	31.7	37	32.2	10	8.8	83	72.7	31	27.3	114
Business Administration & Commerce	9	33.3	8	29.4	3	9.8	20	72.5	7	27.5	27
College St. Jean	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	1
Dental Hygiene	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	1
Dentistry	1	66.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	66.7	1	33.3	2
Education	39	32.2	37	30.6	9	7.4	85	70.2	36	29.8	121
Engineering	15	37.2	15	37.2	3	7.7	33	82.1	7	17.9	40
Graduate Studies	15	31.6	9	18.9	2	42	26	54.7	22	45.3	48
Household Economics	5	39.1	4	34.8	1	8.7	10	82.6	2	17.4	12
Law	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	16.7	3	83.3	1	16.7	4
Medical Laboratory Science	1	33.3	0	0.0	2	66.7	3	100.0	0	0.0	3
Medicine	4	29.6	1	7.4	1	3.7	6	40.7	8	59.3	14
Nursing	3	46.2	2	23.1	1	7.7	6	77.0	2	23.1	8
Pharmacy	2	27.3	3	45.5	1	18.2	6	91.0	1	9.1	7
Physical Education	3	26.3	3	26.3	2	21.1	8	73.7	3	26.3	11
Rehabilitation Medicine	5	33.3	8	50.0	2	10.0	15	93.3	1	6.7	16
Science	35	36.3	27	27.9	10	10.0	72	74.2	25	25.8	97

TABLE V

STUDENT RECREATION FACILITIES USE-IMPORTANCE BY FACULTY

Return Home

A. Reported in Number of Students and Row Percent

FACULTY	DEGREES OF USE									
	HIGH		MEDIUM		LOW		TOTAL USE		DON'T USE	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Agriculture	2	0.8	2	1.2	0	0.0	4	0.8	11	4.6
Arts	48	19.0	37	23.0	21	26.2	106	21.5	49	20.7
Business Administration & Commerce	14	5.5	12	7.5	6	7.5	32	6.5	9	3.8
College St. Jean	1	0.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.2	0	0.0
Dental Hygiene	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Dentistry	1	0.4	0	0.0	1	1.2	2	0.4	1	0.4
Education	70	27.7	40	24.8	15	18.8	125	25.3	45	19.0
Engineering	16	6.3	7	4.3	8	10.0	31	6.3	24	10.1
Graduate Studies	23	9.1	15	9.3	1	1.2	39	7.9	24	10.1
Household Economics	8	3.2	2	1.2	3	3.7	13	2.6	3	1.3
Law	8	3.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	1.6	3	1.3
Medical Laboratory Science	0	0	1	0.6	0	0.0	1	0.2	2	0.8
Medicine	4	1.6	2	1.2	3	3.7	9	1.8	5	2.1
Nursing	5	2.0	1	0.6	1	1.2	7	1.4	0	0.0
Pharmacy	3	1.2	1	0.6	0	0.0	4	0.8	1	0.4
Physical Education	7	2.8	5	3.1	1	1.2	13	2.6	5	2.1
Rehabilitation Medicine	3	1.2	4	2.5	7	8.7	14	2.8	5	2.1
Science	40	15.8	32	19.9	13	16.2	85	17.2	50	21.1
TOTAL	253		161		80		494		237	

B. Reported in Number of Students and Column Percent

FACULTY	DEGREES OF USE										
	HIGH		MEDIUM		LOW		TOTAL USE		DON'T USE		TOTAL
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
Agriculture	2	13.3	2	13.3	0	0.0	4	26.9	11	73.3	15
Arts	48	31.0	37	23.9	21	13.5	106	68.4	49	31.6	155
Business Administration & Commerce	14	34.1	12	29.3	6	14.6	32	78.0	9	22.0	41
College St. Jean	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	1
Dental Hygiene	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Dentistry	1	33.3	0	0.0	1	33.3	2	66.6	1	33.3	3
Education	70	41.2	40	23.5	15	8.8	125	73.5	45	26.5	170
Engineering	16	29.1	7	12.7	8	14.5	31	56.3	24	43.6	55
Graduate Studies	23	36.5	15	23.8	1	1.6	39	61.9	24	38.1	63
Household Economics	8	50.0	2	12.5	3	18.8	13	81.3	3	18.8	16
Law	8	72.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	72.7	3	27.3	11
Medical Laboratory Science	0	0.0	1	33.3	0	0.0	1	33.3	2	66.7	3
Medicine	4	28.6	2	14.3	3	21.4	9	64.3	5	35.7	14
Nursing	5	71.4	1	14.3	1	14.3	7	100.0	0	0.0	7
Pharmacy	3	60.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	4	80.0	1	20.0	5
Physical Education	7	38.9	5	27.8	1	5.6	13	72.3	5	27.8	18
Rehabilitation Medicine	3	15.8	4	21.1	7	36.8	14	73.7	5	26.3	19
Science	40	29.6	32	23.7	13	9.6	85	62.9	50	37.0	135